

1 for Production No. 11 after Defendants serve their Local Rule 26.2 pre-discovery disclosures or on
2 May 15, 2007 (concurrent with the filing of Plaintiffs' Response), and will supplement this response
3 seasonably after Defendants yield all requested jurisdictional discovery.

4 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 12:**

5 All documents, electronically stored information, and things relating to or resulting from your
6 Freedom of Information Act requests submitted to the United States Navy and United States Air Force
7 Exchanges in the Territory of Guam.

8 **OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 12:**

9 Plaintiffs object to Request for Production No. 12 as premature. Neither Defendant has served
10 pre-discovery disclosures in this case as required by Local Rule 26.2 and Federal Rule of Civil
11 Procedure 26(a). Because no pre-discovery disclosures have been made, Plaintiffs are under no
12 obligation whatsoever to respond.

13 Plaintiffs object to Request for Production No. 12 because it seeks information regarding the
14 continuing investigation being conducted by Plaintiffs' counsel and Plaintiffs' Response, which is still
15 being prepared by Plaintiffs' counsel and has not yet been filed. Such information is protected by the
16 work product privilege and doctrine.

17 Plaintiffs object to Request for Production No. 12 as premature because it seeks information
18 that is the subject of Plaintiffs' Response, which according to the Court's February 26, 2007 Order, is
19 not due until May 15, 2007.

20 Subject to the foregoing objections, Plaintiffs will provide information responsive to Request
21 for Production No. 12 after Defendants serve their Local Rule 26.2 pre-discovery disclosures or on
22 May 15, 2007 (concurrent with the filing of Plaintiffs' Response).

23 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 13:**

24 All documents, electronically stored information, and things demonstrating, showing or

1 otherwise relating to your allegation in Paragraph 21 of your First Amended Complaint that FMA has
 2 or had knowledge that its products would be utilized or contained in a significant number of consumer
 3 products sold in the Territory of Guam.

4 **OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 13:**

5 Plaintiffs object to Request for Production No. 13 as premature. Neither Defendant has served
 6 pre-discovery disclosures in this case as required by Local Rule 26.2 and Federal Rule of Civil
 7 Procedure 26(a). Because no pre-discovery disclosures have been made, Plaintiffs are under no
 8 obligation whatsoever to respond.

9 Plaintiffs object to Request for Production No. 13 because it seeks information regarding the
 10 pre-suit investigation conducted by Plaintiffs' counsel, the continuing investigation being conducted by
 11 Plaintiffs' counsel, and Plaintiffs' Response, which is still being prepared by Plaintiffs' counsel and has
 12 not yet been filed. Such information is protected by the work product privilege and doctrine.

13 Plaintiffs object to Request for Production No. 13 as premature because it seeks information
 14 that is the subject of Plaintiffs' Response, which according to the Court's February 26, 2007 Order, is
 15 not due until May 15, 2007.

16 Plaintiffs object to Request for Production No. 13 because it calls for the product of
 17 jurisdictional discovery that Defendants have yet to fully yield.

18 Subject to the foregoing objections, Plaintiffs will provide information responsive to Request
 19 for Production No. 13 after Defendants serve their Local Rule 26.2 pre-discovery disclosures or on
 20 May 15, 2007 (concurrent with the filing of Plaintiffs' Response), and will supplement this response
 21 seasonably after Defendants yield all requested jurisdictional discovery.

22 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 14:**

23 All documents, electronically stored information, and things demonstrating, showing or
 24 otherwise relating to your allegation in Paragraph 21 of your First Amended Complaint that FMA's

1 microelectronics are present in "products produced by major manufacturers of consumer electronics
 2 and extensively distributed throughout the United States and the Territory of Guam."

3 **OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 14:**

4 Plaintiffs object to Request for Production No. 14 as premature. Neither Defendant has served
 5 pre-discovery disclosures in this case as required by Local Rule 26.2 and Federal Rule of Civil
 6 Procedure 26(a). Because no pre-discovery disclosures have been made, Plaintiffs are under no
 7 obligation whatsoever to respond.

8 Plaintiffs object to Request for Production No. 14 because it seeks information regarding the
 9 pre-suit investigation conducted by Plaintiffs' counsel, the continuing investigation being conducted by
 10 Plaintiffs' counsel, and Plaintiffs' Response, which is still being prepared by Plaintiffs' counsel and has
 11 not yet been filed. Such information is protected by the work product privilege and doctrine.

12 Plaintiffs object to Request for Production No. 14 as premature because it seeks information
 13 that is the subject of Plaintiffs' Response, which according to the Court's February 26, 2007 Order, is
 14 not due until May 15, 2007.

15 Plaintiffs object to Request for Production No. 14 because it calls for the product of
 16 jurisdictional discovery that Defendants have yet to fully yield.

17 Subject to the foregoing objections, Plaintiffs will provide information responsive to Request
 18 for Production No. 14 after Defendants serve their Local Rule 26.2 pre-discovery disclosures or on
 19 May 15, 2007 (concurrent with the filing of Plaintiffs' Response), and will supplement this response
 20 seasonably after Defendants yield all requested jurisdictional discovery.

21 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 15:**

22 All documents, electronically stored information, and things demonstrating, showing or
 23 otherwise relating to your allegation in Paragraph 22 of your First Amended Complaint that "a
 24 substantial number of retail outlets in the Territory of Guam regularly carry and sell consumer products

1 containing microelectronics manufactured by FMA."

2 **OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 15:**

3 Plaintiffs object to Request for Production No. 15 as premature. Neither Defendant has served
4 pre-discovery disclosures in this case as required by Local Rule 26.2 and Federal Rule of Civil
5 Procedure 26(a). Because no pre-discovery disclosures have been made, Plaintiffs are under no
6 obligation whatsoever to respond.

7 Plaintiffs object to Request for Production No. 15 because it seeks information regarding the
8 pre-suit investigation conducted by Plaintiffs' counsel, the continuing investigation being conducted by
9 Plaintiffs' counsel, and Plaintiffs' Response, which is still being prepared by Plaintiffs' counsel and has
10 not yet been filed. Such information is protected by the work product privilege and doctrine.

11 Plaintiffs object to Request for Production No. 15 as premature because it seeks information
12 that is the subject of Plaintiffs' Response, which according to the Court's February 26, 2007 Order, is
13 not due until May 15, 2007.

14 Plaintiffs object to Request for Production No. 15 because it calls for the product of
15 jurisdictional discovery that Defendants have yet to fully yield.

16 Subject to the foregoing objections, Plaintiffs will provide information responsive to Request
17 for Production No. 15 after Defendants serve their Local Rule 26.2 pre-discovery disclosures or on
18 May 15, 2007 (concurrent with the filing of Plaintiffs' Response), and will supplement this response
19 seasonably after Defendants yield all requested jurisdictional discovery.

20 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 16:**

21 All documents, electronically stored information, and things demonstrating, showing or
22 otherwise relating to your allegation in Paragraph 23 of your First Amended Complaint that "people
23 and businesses in the Territory of Guam can order and purchase electronic products containing
24 microelectronics manufactured by FMA."

1 **OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 16:**

2 Plaintiffs object to Request for Production No. 16 as premature. Neither Defendant has served
 3 pre-discovery disclosures in this case as required by Local Rule 26.2 and Federal Rule of Civil
 4 Procedure 26(a). Because no pre-discovery disclosures have been made, Plaintiffs are under no
 5 obligation whatsoever to respond.

6 Plaintiffs object to Request for Production No. 16 because it seeks information regarding the
 7 pre-suit investigation conducted by Plaintiffs' counsel, the continuing investigation being conducted by
 8 Plaintiffs' counsel, and Plaintiffs' Response, which is still being prepared by Plaintiffs' counsel and has
 9 not yet been filed. Such information is protected by the work product privilege and doctrine.

10 Plaintiffs object to Request for Production No. 16 as premature because it seeks information
 11 that is the subject of Plaintiffs' Response, which according to the Court's February 26, 2007 Order, is
 12 not due until May 15, 2007.

13 Plaintiffs object to Request for Production No. 16 because it calls for the product of
 14 jurisdictional discovery that Defendants have yet to fully yield.

15 Subject to the foregoing objections, Plaintiffs will provide information responsive to Request
 16 for Production No. 16 after Defendants serve their Local Rule 26.2 pre-discovery disclosures or on
 17 May 15, 2007 (concurrent with the filing of Plaintiffs' Response), and will supplement this response
 18 seasonably after Defendants yield all requested jurisdictional discovery.

19 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 17:**

20 All documents, electronically stored information, and things demonstrating, showing or
 21 otherwise relating to your conclusion in Paragraph 3 of your First Amended Complaint that Fujitsu
 22 Limited engaged in business in the Territory of Guam.

23 **OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 17:**

24 Plaintiffs object to Request for Production No. 17 as premature. Neither Defendant has served

1 pre-discovery disclosures in this case as required by Local Rule 26.2 and Federal Rule of Civil
 2 Procedure 26(a). Because no pre-discovery disclosures have been made, Plaintiffs are under no
 3 obligation whatsoever to respond.

4 Plaintiffs object to Request for Production No. 17 because it seeks information regarding the
 5 pre-suit investigation conducted by Plaintiffs' counsel, the continuing investigation being conducted by
 6 Plaintiffs' counsel, and Plaintiffs' Response, which is still being prepared by Plaintiffs' counsel and has
 7 not yet been filed. Such information is protected by the work product privilege and doctrine.

8 Plaintiffs object to Request for Production No. 17 as premature because it seeks information
 9 that is the subject of Plaintiffs' Response, which according to the Court's February 26, 2007 Order, is
 10 not due until May 15, 2007.

11 Plaintiffs object to Request for Production No. 17 because it calls for the product of
 12 jurisdictional discovery that Defendants have yet to fully yield.

13 Subject to the foregoing objections, Plaintiffs will provide information responsive to Request
 14 for Production No. 17 after Defendants serve their Local Rule 26.2 pre-discovery disclosures or on
 15 May 15, 2007 (concurrent with the filing of Plaintiffs' Response), and will supplement this response
 16 seasonably after Defendants yield all requested jurisdictional discovery.

17 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 18:**

18 All documents, electronically stored information, and things demonstrating, showing or
 19 otherwise relating to your conclusion in Paragraph 3 of your First Amended Complaint that Fujitsu
 20 Limited has systematic and continuous contacts in the Territory of Guam.

21 **OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 18:**

22 Plaintiffs object to Request for Production No. 18 as premature. Neither Defendant has served
 23 pre-discovery disclosures in this case as required by Local Rule 26.2 and Federal Rule of Civil
 24 Procedure 26(a). Because no pre-discovery disclosures have been made, Plaintiffs are under no
 25

1 obligation whatsoever to respond.

2 Plaintiffs object to Request for Production No. 18 because it seeks information regarding the
 3 pre-suit investigation conducted by Plaintiffs' counsel, the continuing investigation being conducted by
 4 Plaintiffs' counsel, and Plaintiffs' Response, which is still being prepared by Plaintiffs' counsel and has
 5 not yet been filed. Such information is protected by the work product privilege and doctrine.
 6

7 Plaintiffs object to Request for Production No. 18 as premature because it seeks information
 8 that is the subject of Plaintiffs' Response, which according to the Court's February 26, 2007 Order, is
 9 not due until May 15, 2007.

10 Plaintiffs object to Request for Production No. 18 because it calls for the product of
 11 jurisdictional discovery that Defendants have yet to fully yield.
 12

13 Subject to the foregoing objections, Plaintiffs will provide information responsive to Request
 14 for Production No. 18 after Defendants serve their Local Rule 26.2 pre-discovery disclosures or on
 15 May 15, 2007 (concurrent with the filing of Plaintiffs' Response), and will supplement this response
 16 seasonably after Defendants yield all requested jurisdictional discovery.

17 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 19:**

18 All documents, electronically stored information, and things demonstrating, showing or
 19 otherwise relating to your conclusion in Paragraph 3 of your First Amended Complaint that this
 20 proceeding arises out of business done in the Territory of Guam.
 21

22 **OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 19:**

23 Plaintiffs object to Request for Production No. 19 as premature. Neither Defendant has served
 24 pre-discovery disclosures in this case as required by Local Rule 26.2 and Federal Rule of Civil
 25 Procedure 26(a). Because no pre-discovery disclosures have been made, Plaintiffs are under no
 26 obligation whatsoever to respond.
 27

28 Plaintiffs object to Request for Production No. 19 because it seeks information regarding the

1 pre-suit investigation conducted by Plaintiffs' counsel, the continuing investigation being conducted by
2 Plaintiffs' counsel, and Plaintiffs' Response, which is still being prepared by Plaintiffs' counsel and has
3 not yet been filed. Such information is protected by the work product privilege and doctrine.
4

5 Plaintiffs object to Request for Production No. 19 as premature because it seeks information
6 that is the subject of Plaintiffs' Response, which according to the Court's February 26, 2007 Order, is
7 not due until May 15, 2007.
8

9 Plaintiffs object to Request for Production No. 19 because it calls for the product of
jurisdictional discovery that Defendants have yet to fully yield.
10

11 Subject to the foregoing objections, Plaintiffs will provide information responsive to Request
12 for Production No. 19 after Defendants serve their Local Rule 26.2 pre-discovery disclosures or on
13 May 15, 2007 (concurrent with the filing of Plaintiffs' Response), and will supplement this response
14 seasonably after Defendants yield all requested jurisdictional discovery.
15

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 20:

16 All documents, electronically stored information, and things demonstrating, showing or
17 otherwise relating to your conclusion in Paragraph 4 of your First Amended Complaint that FMA
18 engages in business in the Territory of Guam.
19

OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 20:

20 Plaintiffs object to Request for Production No. 20 as premature. Neither Defendant has served
21 pre-discovery disclosures in this case as required by Local Rule 26.2 and Federal Rule of Civil
22 Procedure 26(a). Because no pre-discovery disclosures have been made, Plaintiffs are under no
23 obligation whatsoever to respond.
24

25 Plaintiffs object to Request for Production No. 20 because it seeks information regarding the
26 pre-suit investigation conducted by Plaintiffs' counsel, the continuing investigation being conducted by
27 Plaintiffs' counsel, and Plaintiffs' Response, which is still being prepared by Plaintiffs' counsel and has
28

1 not yet been filed. Such information is protected by the work product privilege and doctrine.

2 Plaintiffs object to Request for Production No. 20 as premature because it seeks information
 3 that is the subject of Plaintiffs' Response, which according to the Court's February 26, 2007 Order, is
 4 not due until May 15, 2007.
 5

6 Plaintiffs object to Request for Production No. 20 because it calls for the product of
 7 jurisdictional discovery that Defendants have yet to fully yield.
 8

9 Subject to the foregoing objections, Plaintiffs will provide information responsive to Request
 10 for Production No. 20 after Defendants serve their Local Rule 26.2 pre-discovery disclosures or on
 11 May 15, 2007 (concurrent with the filing of Plaintiffs' Response), and will supplement this response
 12 seasonably after Defendants yield all requested jurisdictional discovery.
 13

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 21:

14 All documents, electronically stored information, and things demonstrating, showing or
 15 otherwise relating to your conclusion in Paragraph 4 of your First Amended Complaint that FMA has
 16 systematic and continuous contacts in the Territory of Guam.
 17

OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 21:

18 Plaintiffs object to Request for Production No. 21 as premature. Neither Defendant has served
 19 pre-discovery disclosures in this case as required by Local Rule 26.2 and Federal Rule of Civil
 20 Procedure 26(a). Because no pre-discovery disclosures have been made, Plaintiffs are under no
 21 obligation whatsoever to respond.
 22

23 Plaintiffs object to Request for Production No. 21 because it seeks information regarding the
 24 pre-suit investigation conducted by Plaintiffs' counsel, the continuing investigation being conducted by
 25 Plaintiffs' counsel, and Plaintiffs' Response, which is still being prepared by Plaintiffs' counsel and has
 26 not yet been filed. Such information is protected by the work product privilege and doctrine.
 27

28 Plaintiffs object to Request for Production No. 21 as premature because it seeks information

1 that is the subject of Plaintiffs' Response, which according to the Court's February 26, 2007 Order, is
 2 not due until May 15, 2007.

3 Plaintiffs object to Request for Production No. 21 because it calls for the product of
 4 jurisdictional discovery that Defendants have yet to fully yield.
 5

6 Subject to the foregoing objections, Plaintiffs will provide information responsive to Request
 7 for Production No. 21 after Defendants serve their Local Rule 26.2 pre-discovery disclosures or on
 8 May 15, 2007 (concurrent with the filing of Plaintiffs' Response), and will supplement this response
 9 seasonably after Defendants yield all requested jurisdictional discovery.

10 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 22:**

11 All documents, electronically stored information, and things demonstrating, showing or
 12 otherwise relating to your conclusion in Paragraph 4 of your First Amended Complaint that this
 13 proceeding arises out of business done in the Territory of Guam.
 14

15 **OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 22:**

16 Plaintiffs object to Request for Production No. 22 as premature. Neither Defendant has served
 17 pre-discovery disclosures in this case as required by Local Rule 26.2 and Federal Rule of Civil
 18 Procedure 26(a). Because no pre-discovery disclosures have been made, Plaintiffs are under no
 19 obligation whatsoever to respond.
 20

21 Plaintiffs object to Request for Production No. 22 because it seeks information regarding the
 22 pre-suit investigation conducted by Plaintiffs' counsel, the continuing investigation being conducted by
 23 Plaintiffs' counsel, and Plaintiffs' Response, which is still being prepared by Plaintiffs' counsel and has
 24 not yet been filed. Such information is protected by the work product privilege and doctrine.
 25

26 Plaintiffs object to Request for Production No. 22 as premature because it seeks information
 27 that is the subject of Plaintiffs' Response, which according to the Court's February 26, 2007 Order, is
 28 not due until May 15, 2007.

1 Plaintiffs object to Request for Production No. 22 because it calls for the product of
 2 jurisdictional discovery that Defendants have yet to fully yield.

3 Subject to the foregoing objections, Plaintiffs will provide information responsive to Request
 4 for Production No. 22 after Defendants serve their Local Rule 26.2 pre-discovery disclosures or on
 5 May 15, 2007 (concurrent with the filing of Plaintiffs' Response), and will supplement this response
 6 seasonably after Defendants yield all requested jurisdictional discovery.
 7

8 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 23:**

9 All documents, electronically stored information, and things demonstrating, showing or
 10 otherwise relating to your conclusion in Paragraph 19 of your First Amended Complaint that
 11 "Defendants transact substantial business of a substantial character within the Territory of Guam."

12 **OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 23:**

13 Plaintiffs object to Request for Production No. 23 as premature. Neither Defendant has served
 14 pre-discovery disclosures in this case as required by Local Rule 26.2 and Federal Rule of Civil
 15 Procedure 26(a). Because no pre-discovery disclosures have been made, Plaintiffs are under no
 16 obligation whatsoever to respond.

17 Plaintiffs object to Request for Production No. 23 because it seeks information regarding the
 18 pre-suit investigation conducted by Plaintiffs' counsel, the continuing investigation being conducted by
 19 Plaintiffs' counsel, and Plaintiffs' Response, which is still being prepared by Plaintiffs' counsel and has
 20 not yet been filed. Such information is protected by the work product privilege and doctrine.

21 Plaintiffs object to Request for Production No. 23 as premature because it seeks information
 22 that is the subject of Plaintiffs' Response, which according to the Court's February 26, 2007 Order, is
 23 not due until May 15, 2007.

24 Plaintiffs object to Request for Production No. 23 because it calls for the product of
 25 jurisdictional discovery that Defendants have yet to fully yield.
 26

1 Subject to the foregoing objections, Plaintiffs will provide information responsive to Request
 2 for Production No. 23 after Defendants serve their Local Rule 26.2 pre-discovery disclosures or on
 3 May 15, 2007 (concurrent with the filing of Plaintiffs' Response), and will supplement this response
 4 seasonably after Defendants yield all requested jurisdictional discovery.
 5

6 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 24:**

7 All documents, electronically stored information, and things demonstrating, showing or
 8 otherwise relating to your conclusion in Paragraph 8 of your First Amended Complaint that "each
 9 Defendant has sufficient minimum contacts with the forum as a result of" placing products "into the
 10 stream of commerce with the intention that they would be available to people in the United States and
 11 the Territory of Guam."

12 **OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 24:**

13 Plaintiffs object to Request for Production No. 24 as premature. Neither Defendant has served
 14 pre-discovery disclosures in this case as required by Local Rule 26.2 and Federal Rule of Civil
 15 Procedure 26(a). Because no pre-discovery disclosures have been made, Plaintiffs are under no
 16 obligation whatsoever to respond.

17 Plaintiffs object to Request for Production No. 24 because it seeks information regarding the
 18 pre-suit investigation conducted by Plaintiffs' counsel, the continuing investigation being conducted by
 19 Plaintiffs' counsel, and Plaintiffs' Response, which is still being prepared by Plaintiffs' counsel and has
 20 not yet been filed. Such information is protected by the work product privilege and doctrine.

21 Plaintiffs object to Request for Production No. 24 as premature because it seeks information
 22 that is the subject of Plaintiffs' Response, which according to the Court's February 26, 2007 Order, is
 23 not due until May 15, 2007.

24 Plaintiffs object to Request for Production No. 24 because it calls for the product of
 25 jurisdictional discovery that Defendants have yet to fully yield.
 26

1 Subject to the foregoing objections, Plaintiffs will provide information responsive to Request
 2 for Production No. 24 after Defendants serve their Local Rule 26.2 pre-discovery disclosures or on
 3 May 15, 2007 (concurrent with the filing of Plaintiffs' Response), and will supplement this response
 4 seasonably after Defendants yield all requested jurisdictional discovery.
 5

6 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 25:**

7 All documents, electronically stored information, and things demonstrating, showing or
 8 otherwise relating to your conclusion in Paragraph 9 of your First Amended Complaint that "each
 9 Defendant has sufficient minimum contacts with the forum as a result of business conducted
 10 continuously and systematically within the Territory of Guam."

11 **OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 25:**

12 Plaintiffs object to Request for Production No. 25 as premature. Neither Defendant has served
 13 pre-discovery disclosures in this case as required by Local Rule 26.2 and Federal Rule of Civil
 14 Procedure 26(a). Because no pre-discovery disclosures have been made, Plaintiffs are under no
 15 obligation whatsoever to respond.

16 Plaintiffs object to Request for Production No. 25 because it seeks information regarding the
 17 pre-suit investigation conducted by Plaintiffs' counsel, the continuing investigation being conducted by
 18 Plaintiffs' counsel, and Plaintiffs' Response, which is still being prepared by Plaintiffs' counsel and has
 19 not yet been filed. Such information is protected by the work product privilege and doctrine.

20 Plaintiffs object to Request for Production No. 25 as premature because it seeks information
 21 that is the subject of Plaintiffs' Response, which according to the Court's February 26, 2007 Order, is
 22 not due until May 15, 2007.

23 Plaintiffs object to Request for Production No. 25 because it calls for the product of
 24 jurisdictional discovery that Defendants have yet to fully yield.

25 Subject to the foregoing objections, Plaintiffs will provide information responsive to Request
 26

1 for Production No. 25 after Defendants serve their Local Rule 26.2 pre-discovery disclosures or on
 2 May 15, 2007 (concurrent with the filing of Plaintiffs' Response), and will supplement this response
 3 seasonably after Defendants yield all requested jurisdictional discovery.

4 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 26:**

5 All documents, electronically stored information, and things upon which you rely to support
 6 your response to Interrogatory No. 5 in FUJITSU MICROELECTRONICS AMERICAS, INC.'S
 7 FIRST SET OF INTERROGATORIES (NOS. 1-6) TO PLAINTIFFS.

8 **OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 26:**

9 Plaintiffs incorporate by reference as if fully set forth herein their objections and responses to
 10 Interrogatory No. 5 in FUJITSU MICROELECTRONICS AMERICAS, INC.'S FIRST SET OF
 11 INTERROGATORIES (NOS. 1-6) TO PLAINTIFFS.

12 Plaintiffs object to Request for Production No. 26 as premature. Neither Defendant has served
 13 pre-discovery disclosures in this case as required by Local Rule 26.2 and Federal Rule of Civil
 14 Procedure 26(a). Because no pre-discovery disclosures have been made, Plaintiffs are under no
 15 obligation whatsoever to respond.

16 Plaintiffs object to Request for Production No. 26 because it seeks information regarding the
 17 pre-suit investigation conducted by Plaintiffs' counsel, the continuing investigation being conducted by
 18 Plaintiffs' counsel, and Plaintiffs' Response, which is still being prepared by Plaintiffs' counsel and has
 19 not yet been filed. Such information is protected by the work product privilege and doctrine.

20 Plaintiffs object to Request for Production No. 26 as premature because it seeks information
 21 that is the subject of Plaintiffs' Response, which according to the Court's February 26, 2007 Order, is
 22 not due until May 15, 2007.

23 Plaintiffs object to Request for Production No. 26 because it calls for the product of
 24 jurisdictional discovery that Defendants have yet to fully yield.

1 Subject to the foregoing objections, Plaintiffs will provide information responsive to Request
 2 for Production No. 26 after Defendants serve their Local Rule 26.2 pre-discovery disclosures or on
 3 May 15, 2007 (concurrent with the filing of Plaintiffs' Response) or after Plaintiffs supplement their
 4 objections and responses to Interrogatory No. 5 in FUJITSU MICROELECTRONICS AMERICAS,
 5 INC.'S FIRST SET OF INTERROGATORIES (NOS. 1-6) TO PLAINTIFFS, and will supplement this
 6 response seasonably after Defendants yield all requested jurisdictional discovery.
 7

8 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 27:**

9 All documents, electronically stored information, and things relating to the subject matter of
 10 Interrogatory No. 5 in FUJITSU MICROELECTRONICS AMERICAS, INC.'S FIRST SET OF
 11 INTERROGATORIES (NOS. 1-6) TO PLAINTIFFS.

12 **OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 27:**

13 Plaintiffs incorporate by reference as if fully set forth herein their objections and responses to
 14 Interrogatory No. 5 in FUJITSU MICROELECTRONICS AMERICAS, INC.'S FIRST SET OF
 15 INTERROGATORIES (NOS. 1-6) TO PLAINTIFFS.

16 Plaintiffs object to Request for Production No. 27 as premature. Neither Defendant has served
 17 pre-discovery disclosures in this case as required by Local Rule 26.2 and Federal Rule of Civil
 18 Procedure 26(a). Because no pre-discovery disclosures have been made, Plaintiffs are under no
 19 obligation whatsoever to respond.

20 Plaintiffs object to Request for Production No. 27 because it seeks information regarding the
 21 pre-suit investigation conducted by Plaintiffs' counsel, the continuing investigation being conducted by
 22 Plaintiffs' counsel, and Plaintiffs' Response, which is still being prepared by Plaintiffs' counsel and has
 23 not yet been filed. Such information is protected by the work product privilege and doctrine.

24 Plaintiffs object to Request for Production No. 27 as premature because it seeks information
 25 that is the subject of Plaintiffs' Response, which according to the Court's February 26, 2007 Order, is
 26

1 not due until May 15, 2007.

2 Plaintiffs object to Request for Production No. 27 because it calls for the product of
 3 jurisdictional discovery that Defendants have yet to fully yield.

4 Subject to the foregoing objections, Plaintiffs will provide information responsive to Request
 5 for Production No. 27 after Defendants serve their Local Rule 26.2 pre-discovery disclosures or on
 6 May 15, 2007 (concurrent with the filing of Plaintiffs' Response) or after Plaintiffs supplement their
 7 objections and responses to Interrogatory No. 5 in FUJITSU MICROELECTRONICS AMERICAS,
 8 INC.'S FIRST SET OF INTERROGATORIES (NOS. 1-6) TO PLAINTIFFS, and will supplement this
 9 response seasonably after Defendants yield all requested jurisdictional discovery.
 10

11 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 28:**

12 All documents, electronically stored information, and things upon which you rely to support in
 13 response to Interrogatory No. 6 in FUJITSU MICROELECTRONICS AMERICAS, INC.'S FIRST
 14 SET OF INTERROGATORIES (NOS. 1-6) TO PLAINTIFFS.
 15

16 **OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 28:**

17 Plaintiffs incorporate by reference as if fully set forth herein their objections and responses to
 18 Interrogatory No. 6 in FUJITSU MICROELECTRONICS AMERICAS, INC.'S FIRST SET OF
 19 INTERROGATORIES (NOS. 1-6) TO PLAINTIFFS.
 20

21 Plaintiffs object to Request for Production No. 28 as premature. Neither Defendant has served
 22 pre-discovery disclosures in this case as required by Local Rule 26.2 and Federal Rule of Civil
 23 Procedure 26(a). Because no pre-discovery disclosures have been made, Plaintiffs are under no
 24 obligation whatsoever to respond.

25 Plaintiffs object to Request for Production No. 28 because it seeks information regarding the
 26 pre-suit investigation conducted by Plaintiffs' counsel, the continuing investigation being conducted by
 27 Plaintiffs' counsel, and Plaintiffs' Response, which is still being prepared by Plaintiffs' counsel and has
 28

1 not yet been filed. Such information is protected by the work product privilege and doctrine.

2 Plaintiffs object to Request for Production No. 28 as premature because it seeks information
 3 that is the subject of Plaintiffs' Response, which according to the Court's February 26, 2007 Order, is
 4 not due until May 15, 2007.
 5

6 Plaintiffs object to Request for Production No. 28 because it calls for the product of
 7 jurisdictional discovery that Defendants have yet to fully yield.
 8

9 Subject to the foregoing objections, Plaintiffs will provide information responsive to Request
 10 for Production No. 28 after Defendants serve their Local Rule 26.2 pre-discovery disclosures or on
 11 May 15, 2007 (concurrent with the filing of Plaintiffs' Response) or after Plaintiffs supplement their
 12 objections and responses to Interrogatory No. 6 in FUJITSU MICROELECTRONICS AMERICAS,
 13 INC.'S FIRST SET OF INTERROGATORIES (NOS. 1-6) TO PLAINTIFFS, and will supplement this
 14 response seasonably after Defendants yield all requested jurisdictional discovery.
 15

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 29:

16 All documents, electronically stored information, and things related to the subject matter of
 17 Interrogatory No. 6 in FUJITSU MICROELECTRONICS AMERICAS, INC.'S FIRST SET OF
 18 INTERROGATORIES (NOS. 1-6) TO PLAINTIFFS.
 19

OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 29:

20 Plaintiffs incorporate by reference as if fully set forth herein their objections and responses to
 21 Interrogatory No. 6 in FUJITSU MICROELECTRONICS AMERICAS, INC.'S FIRST SET OF
 22 INTERROGATORIES (NOS. 1-6) TO PLAINTIFFS.
 23

24 Plaintiffs object to Request for Production No. 29 as premature. Neither Defendant has served
 25 pre-discovery disclosures in this case as required by Local Rule 26.2 and Federal Rule of Civil
 26 Procedure 26(a). Because no pre-discovery disclosures have been made, Plaintiffs are under no
 27 obligation whatsoever to respond.
 28

1 Plaintiffs object to Request for Production No. 29 because it seeks information regarding the
 2 pre-suit investigation conducted by Plaintiffs' counsel, the continuing investigation being conducted by
 3 Plaintiffs' counsel, and Plaintiffs' Response, which is still being prepared by Plaintiffs' counsel and has
 4 not yet been filed. Such information is protected by the work product privilege and doctrine.
 5

6 Plaintiffs object to Request for Production No. 29 as premature because it seeks information
 7 that is the subject of Plaintiffs' Response, which according to the Court's February 26, 2007 Order, is
 8 not due until May 15, 2007.

9 Plaintiffs object to Request for Production No. 29 because it calls for the product of
 10 jurisdictional discovery that Defendants have yet to fully yield.

11 Subject to the foregoing objections, Plaintiffs will provide information responsive to Request
 12 for Production No. 29 after Defendants serve their Local Rule 26.2 pre-discovery disclosures or on
 13 May 15, 2007 (concurrent with the filing of Plaintiffs' Response) or after Plaintiffs supplement their
 14 objections and responses to Interrogatory No. 6 in FUJITSU MICROELECTRONICS AMERICAS,
 15 INC.'S FIRST SET OF INTERROGATORIES (NOS. 1-6) TO PLAINTIFFS, and will supplement this
 16 response seasonably after Defendants yield all requested jurisdictional discovery.
 17

19 Dated: April 23, 2007

SHORE CHAN BRAGALONE LLP

21 By: /s/ Alfonso Garcia Chan
 22 ALFONSO GARCIA CHAN, ESQ.
 (admitted *pro hac vice*)

23 ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFFS
 24 Nanya Technology Corp. and
 Nanya Technology Corp. U.S.A.
 25
 26
 27
 28

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing document was served on the following counsel of record via electronic mail and confirmatory first class mail on April 23, 2007:

**Rodney J. Jacob
Daniel M. Benjamin
Calvo & Clark, LLP
655 South Marine Corps Dr., Suite 202
Tamuning, Guam 96913**

Michael M. Murray
Milbank Tweed Hadley & McCloy LLP
1 Chase Manhattan Plaza
New York, New York 10005-1413

/s/ Alfonso Garcia Chan
ALFONSO GARCIA CHAN

ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFFS
Nanya Technology Corp. and
Nanya Technology Corp. U.S.A.

EXHIBIT K

**JOSEPH C. RAZZANO, ESQ.
TEKER TORRES & TEKER, P.C.
SUITE 2A, 130 ASPINALL AVENUE
HAGÅTÑA, GUAM 96910
TELEPHONE: (671) 477-9891/4
FACSIMILE: (671) 472-2601**

**JOHN S. UNPINGCO, ESQ.
UNPINGCO & ASSOCIATES, LLC
SUITE 12B, SINAJANA MALL
SINAJANA, GUAM
TELEPHONE: (671) 475-8545
FACSIMILE: (671) 475-8550**

**MICHAEL W. SHORE
ALFONSO GARCIA CHAN
MARTIN PASCUAL
SHORE CHAN BRAGALONE, LLP
325 NORTH SAINT PAUL STREET, SUITE 4450
DALLAS, TEXAS 75201
TELEPHONE: (214) 593-9110
FACSIMILE: (214) 593-9111**

*Attorneys for Plaintiffs
Nanya Technology Corp. and
Nanya Technology Corp. U.S.A.*

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

DISTRICT OF GUAM

NANYA TECHNOLOGY CORP. and
NANYA TECHNOLOGY CORP. U.S.A.,

Case No. CV-06-00025

Plaintiffs

v.
FUJITSU LIMITED and FUJITSU
MICROELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC.

**PLAINTIFF NANYA TECHNOLOGY
CORPORATION'S OBJECTIONS AND
RESPONSES TO FUJITSU
MICROELECTRONICS AMERICA,
INC.'S FIRST SET OF REQUESTS FOR
ADMISSIONS (NOS. 1-34)**

Defendants.

Pursuant to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and the Local Civil Rules of this Court, Plaintiff Nanya Technology Corp. ("NTC") hereby serves the following Responses and Objections to admissions upon Defendant Fujitsu Microelectronics America, Inc. ("FMA"). NTC hereby reserves the right to supplement all responses to these admissions in accordance with Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 26(e).

OBJECTIONS TO DEFINITIONS AND INSTRUCTIONS

1. NTC objects to the definitions of "Nanya," "you" and "your" to the extent that they encompass "all predecessor or successor companies or corporations" that are not currently part of NTC, to the extent they encompass "present ... investigators, accountants, consultants, attorneys, other representatives, or any other persons acting or purporting to act on behalf of any of them" who are not part of NTC, to the extent they encompass "consultants" otherwise protected by the consulting expert privilege, to the extent they encompass "attorneys" otherwise protected by the attorney client and/or work product privileges, and to the extent they encompass "former offices, directors, employees, agents, investigators, accountants, consultants, attorneys, other representatives, or any other persons acting or purporting to act on behalf of any of them" that are not currently part of NTC.

2. NTC objects to the definition of "document" to the extent it purports to cover subject matter in excess of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 34.

3. NTC objects to the definition of "electronically stored information" to the extent it purports to cover subject matter in excess of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 34.

4. NTC objects to the definition of "identify" to the extent it calls for a response in excess of the minimum requirements of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 36.

5. NTC objects to the Instructions generally to the extent they call for a response in excess of the minimum requirements of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 36.

6. NTC objects to Instruction No. 7 to the extent it recites privilege log requirements in

excess of the requirements called for by this Court, Ninth Circuit precedent, and the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

7. NTC objects to Footnote No. 1 and Defendants' attempted disclaimer that they are not substantively participating in the present lawsuit in Guam.

RESPONSES AND OBJECTIONS TO FMA'S ADMISSIONS

Subject to the foregoing objections, NTC further objects and responds as follows:

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 1:

Admit that Nanya does not maintain any offices in Guam.

OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 1:

NTC objects to Request for Admission No. 1 as premature. FMA has not served pre-discovery disclosures in this case as required by Local Rule 26.2 and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(a). Because no pre-discovery disclosures have been made, NTC is under no obligation whatsoever to respond. NTC further objects to Request for Admission No. 1 as seeking irrelevant to any claim or defense at issue in this case, including but not limited to jurisdiction and convenience. Subject to the foregoing objections, NTC will supplement and respond to the relevant subject matter, if any, called for by Request for Admission No. 1 seasonably after FMA serves its Local Rule 26.2 pre-discovery disclosures.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 2:

Admit that Nanya does not maintain any operations in Guam.

OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 2:

NTC objects to Request for Admission No. 2 as premature. FMA has not served pre-discovery disclosures in this case as required by Local Rule 26.2 and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(a). Because no pre-discovery disclosures have been made, NTC is under no obligation whatsoever to respond. NTC further objects to Request for Admission No. 2 as seeking irrelevant to any claim or

1 defense at issue in this case, including but not limited to jurisdiction and convenience. Subject to the
2 foregoing objections, NTC will supplement and respond to the relevant subject matter, if any, called
3 for by Request for Admission No. 2 seasonably after FMA serves its Local Rule 26.2 pre-discovery
4 disclosures.

5 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 3:**

6 Admit that Nanya does not have any employees in Guam.

7 **OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 3:**

8 NTC objects to Request for Admission No. 3 as premature. FMA has not served pre-discovery
9 disclosures in this case as required by Local Rule 26.2 and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(a).
10 Because no pre-discovery disclosures have been made, NTC is under no obligation whatsoever to
11 respond. NTC further objects to Request for Admission No. 3 as seeking irrelevant to any claim or
12 defense at issue in this case, including but not limited to jurisdiction and convenience. Subject to the
13 foregoing objections, NTC will supplement and respond to the relevant subject matter, if any, called
14 for by Request for Admission No. 3 seasonably after FMA serves its Local Rule 26.2 pre-discovery
15 disclosures.

16 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 4:**

17 Admit that Nanya does not have any affiliates in Guam.

18 **OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 4:**

19 NTC objects to Request for Admission No. 4 as premature. FMA has not served pre-discovery
20 disclosures in this case as required by Local Rule 26.2 and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(a).
21 Because no pre-discovery disclosures have been made, NTC is under no obligation whatsoever to
22 respond. NTC further objects to Request for Admission No. 4 as seeking irrelevant to any claim or
23 defense at issue in this case, including but not limited to jurisdiction and convenience. Subject to the
24 foregoing objections, NTC will supplement and respond to the relevant subject matter, if any, called
25
26
27
28

1 for by Request for Admission No. 4 seasonably after FMA serves its Local Rule 26.2 pre-discovery
 2 disclosures.

3 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 5:**

4 Admit that Nanya does not have any salespersons in Guam.

5 **OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 5:**

6 NTC objects to Request for Admission No. 5 as premature. FMA has not served pre-discovery
 7 disclosures in this case as required by Local Rule 26.2 and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(a).
 8 Because no pre-discovery disclosures have been made, NTC is under no obligation whatsoever to
 9 respond. NTC further objects to Request for Admission No. 5 as seeking irrelevant to any claim or
 10 defense at issue in this case, including but not limited to jurisdiction and convenience. Subject to the
 11 foregoing objections, NTC will supplement and respond to the relevant subject matter, if any, called
 12 for by Request for Admission No. 5 seasonably after FMA serves its Local Rule 26.2 pre-discovery
 13 disclosures.

14 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 6:**

15 Admit that Nanya has not advertised any products in the Guam local newspapers or Guam local
 16 magazines in the six years before the Complaint was filed in this action.

17 **OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 6:**

18 NTC objects to Request for Admission No. 6 as premature. FMA has not served pre-discovery
 19 disclosures in this case as required by Local Rule 26.2 and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(a).
 20 Because no pre-discovery disclosures have been made, NTC is under no obligation whatsoever to
 21 respond. NTC further objects to Request for Admission No. 6 as seeking irrelevant to any claim or
 22 defense at issue in this case, including but not limited to jurisdiction and convenience. Subject to the
 23 foregoing objections, NTC will supplement and respond to the relevant subject matter, if any, called
 24 for by Request for Admission No. 6 seasonably after FMA serves its Local Rule 26.2 pre-discovery
 25 disclosures.

1 disclosures.

2 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 7:**

3 Admit that Nanya has not advertised any services in the Guam local newspapers or Guam local
4 magazines in the six years before the Complaint was filed in this action.
5

6 **OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 7:**

7 NTC objects to Request for Admission No. 7 as premature. FMA has not served pre-discovery
8 disclosures in this case as required by Local Rule 26.2 and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(a).
9 Because no pre-discovery disclosures have been made, NTC is under no obligation whatsoever to
10 respond. NTC further objects to Request for Admission No. 7 as seeking irrelevant to any claim or
11 defense at issue in this case, including but not limited to jurisdiction and convenience. Subject to the
12 foregoing objections, NTC will supplement and respond to the relevant subject matter, if any, called
13 for by Request for Admission No. 7 seasonably after FMA serves its Local Rule 26.2 pre-discovery
14 disclosures.
15

16 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 8:**

17 Admit that Nanya does not have real property in Guam.
18

19 **OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 8:**

20 NTC objects to Request for Admission No. 8 as premature. FMA has not served pre-discovery
21 disclosures in this case as required by Local Rule 26.2 and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(a).
22 Because no pre-discovery disclosures have been made, NTC is under no obligation whatsoever to
23 respond. NTC further objects to Request for Admission No. 8 as seeking irrelevant to any claim or
24 defense at issue in this case, including but not limited to jurisdiction and convenience. Subject to the
25 foregoing objections, NTC will supplement and respond to the relevant subject matter, if any, called
26 for by Request for Admission No. 8 seasonably after FMA serves its Local Rule 26.2 pre-discovery
27 disclosures.
28

1 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 9:**

2 Admit that Nanya does not lease any facility in Guam.

3 **OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 9:**

4 NTC objects to Request for Admission No. 9 as premature. FMA has not served pre-discovery
5 disclosures in this case as required by Local Rule 26.2 and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(a).
6 Because no pre-discovery disclosures have been made, NTC is under no obligation whatsoever to
7 respond. NTC further objects to Request for Admission No. 9 as seeking irrelevant to any claim or
8 defense at issue in this case, including but not limited to jurisdiction and convenience. Subject to the
9 foregoing objections, NTC will supplement and respond to the relevant subject matter, if any, called
10 for by Request for Admission No. 9 seasonably after FMA serves its Local Rule 26.2 pre-discovery
11 disclosures.
12

13 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 10:**

14 Admit that Nanya does not have a bank account in Guam.

15 **OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 10:**

16 NTC objects to Request for Admission No. 10 as premature. FMA has not served pre-
17 discovery disclosures in this case as required by Local Rule 26.2 and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure
18 26(a). Because no pre-discovery disclosures have been made, NTC is under no obligation whatsoever
19 to respond. NTC further objects to Request for Admission No. 10 as seeking irrelevant to any claim or
20 defense at issue in this case, including but not limited to jurisdiction and convenience. Subject to the
21 foregoing objections, NTC will supplement and respond to the relevant subject matter, if any, called
22 for by Request for Admission No. 10 seasonably after FMA serves its Local Rule 26.2 pre-discovery
23 disclosures.
24

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 11:

Admit that Nanya does not maintain a telephone number in Guam.

OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 11:

NTC objects to Request for Admission No. 11 as premature. FMA has not served pre-discovery disclosures in this case as required by Local Rule 26.2 and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(a). Because no pre-discovery disclosures have been made, NTC is under no obligation whatsoever to respond. NTC further objects to Request for Admission No. 11 as seeking irrelevant to any claim or defense at issue in this case, including but not limited to jurisdiction and convenience. Subject to the foregoing objections, NTC will supplement and respond to the relevant subject matter, if any, called for by Request for Admission No. 11 seasonably after FMA serves its Local Rule 26.2 pre-discovery disclosures.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 12:

Admit that Nanya does not maintain a telefax number in Guam.

OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 12:

NTC objects to Request for Admission No. 12 as premature. FMA has not served pre-discovery disclosures in this case as required by Local Rule 26.2 and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(a). Because no pre-discovery disclosures have been made, NTC is under no obligation whatsoever to respond. NTC further objects to Request for Admission No. 12 as seeking irrelevant to any claim or defense at issue in this case, including but not limited to jurisdiction and convenience. Subject to the foregoing objections, NTC will supplement and respond to the relevant subject matter, if any, called for by Request for Admission No. 12 seasonably after FMA serves its Local Rule 26.2 pre-discovery disclosures.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 13:

Admit that Nanya does not have a telex number in Guam.

OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 13:

NTC objects to Request for Admission No. 13 as premature. FMA has not served pre-discovery disclosures in this case as required by Local Rule 26.2 and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(a). Because no pre-discovery disclosures have been made, NTC is under no obligation whatsoever to respond. NTC further objects to Request for Admission No. 13 as seeking irrelevant to any claim or defense at issue in this case, including but not limited to jurisdiction and convenience. Subject to the foregoing objections, NTC will supplement and respond to the relevant subject matter, if any, called for by Request for Admission No. 13 seasonably after FMA serves its Local Rule 26.2 pre-discovery disclosures.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 14:

Admit that Nanya does not have any directors in Guam.

OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 14:

NTC objects to Request for Admission No. 14 as premature. FMA has not served pre-discovery disclosures in this case as required by Local Rule 26.2 and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(a). Because no pre-discovery disclosures have been made, NTC is under no obligation whatsoever to respond. NTC further objects to Request for Admission No. 14 as seeking irrelevant to any claim or defense at issue in this case, including but not limited to jurisdiction and convenience. Subject to the foregoing objections, NTC will supplement and respond to the relevant subject matter, if any, called for by Request for Admission No. 14 seasonably after FMA serves its Local Rule 26.2 pre-discovery disclosures.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 15:

Admit that Nanya does not have any officers in Guam.

OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 15:

NTC objects to Request for Admission No. 15 as premature. FMA has not served pre-

1 discovery disclosures in this case as required by Local Rule 26.2 and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure
2 26(a). Because no pre-discovery disclosures have been made, NTC is under no obligation whatsoever
3 to respond. NTC further objects to Request for Admission No. 15 as seeking irrelevant to any claim or
4 defense at issue in this case, including but not limited to jurisdiction and convenience. Subject to the
5 foregoing objections, NTC will supplement and respond to the relevant subject matter, if any, called
6 for by Request for Admission No. 15 seasonably after FMA serves its Local Rule 26.2 pre-discovery
7 disclosures.

9 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 16:**

10 Admit that Nanya does not maintain a post office box in Guam.

11 **OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 16:**

12 NTC objects to Request for Admission No. 16 as premature. FMA has not served pre-
13 discovery disclosures in this case as required by Local Rule 26.2 and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure
14 26(a). Because no pre-discovery disclosures have been made, NTC is under no obligation whatsoever
15 to respond. NTC further objects to Request for Admission No. 16 as seeking irrelevant to any claim or
16 defense at issue in this case, including but not limited to jurisdiction and convenience. Subject to the
17 foregoing objections, NTC will supplement and respond to the relevant subject matter, if any, called
18 for by Request for Admission No. 16 seasonably after FMA serves its Local Rule 26.2 pre-discovery
19 disclosures.

20 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 17:**

21 Admit that Nanya does not maintain a street address in Guam.

22 **OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 17:**

23 NTC objects to Request for Admission No. 17 as premature. FMA has not served pre-
24 discovery disclosures in this case as required by Local Rule 26.2 and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure
25 26(a). Because no pre-discovery disclosures have been made, NTC is under no obligation whatsoever

1 to respond. NTC further objects to Request for Admission No. 17 as seeking irrelevant to any claim or
 2 defense at issue in this case, including but not limited to jurisdiction and convenience. Subject to the
 3 foregoing objections, NTC will supplement and respond to the relevant subject matter, if any, called
 4 for by Request for Admission No. 17 seasonably after FMA serves its Local Rule 26.2 pre-discovery
 5 disclosures.

6

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 18:

7

8 Admit that prior to engaging Guam counsel to file *Nanya Tech. Corp. v. Fujitsu Limited*, No.
 9 06-CV-00025 in the District of Guam, Nanya has never been party to a lawsuit or legal proceeding in
 10 any Guam Federal District Court.

11

OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 18:

12

13 NTC objects to Request for Admission No. 18 as premature. FMA has not served pre-
 14 discovery disclosures in this case as required by Local Rule 26.2 and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure
 15 26(a). Because no pre-discovery disclosures have been made, NTC is under no obligation whatsoever
 16 to respond. NTC further objects to Request for Admission No. 18 as seeking irrelevant to any claim or
 17 defense at issue in this case, including but not limited to jurisdiction and convenience. Subject to the
 18 foregoing objections, NTC will supplement and respond to the relevant subject matter, if any, called
 19 for by Request for Admission No. 18 seasonably after FMA serves its Local Rule 26.2 pre-discovery
 20 disclosures.

21

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 19:

22

23 Admit that prior to engaging Guam counsel to file *Nanya Tech. Corp. v. Fujitsu Limited*, No.
 24 06-CV-00025 in the District of Guam, Nanya did not have in Guam any documents relevant to the
 25 subject matter of this lawsuit.

26

OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 19:

27

28 NTC objects to Request for Admission No. 19 as premature. FMA has not served pre-

1 discovery disclosures in this case as required by Local Rule 26.2 and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure
2 26(a). Because no pre-discovery disclosures have been made, NTC is under no obligation whatsoever
3 to respond. NTC further objects to Request for Admission No. 19 as seeking irrelevant to any claim or
4 defense at issue in this case, including but not limited to jurisdiction and convenience. Subject to the
5 foregoing objections, NTC will supplement and respond to the relevant subject matter, if any, called
6 for by Request for Admission No. 19 seasonably after FMA serves its Local Rule 26.2 pre-discovery
7 disclosures.

9 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 20:**

10 Admit that prior to engaging Guam counsel to file *Nanya Tech. Corp. v. Fujitsu Limited*, No.
11 06-CV-00025 in the District of Guam, Nanya had not appointed an agent in Guam for service of
12 process.

14 **OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 20:**

15 NTC objects to Request for Admission No. 20 as premature. FMA has not served pre-
16 discovery disclosures in this case as required by Local Rule 26.2 and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure
17 26(a). Because no pre-discovery disclosures have been made, NTC is under no obligation whatsoever
18 to respond. NTC further objects to Request for Admission No. 20 as seeking irrelevant to any claim or
19 defense at issue in this case, including but not limited to jurisdiction and convenience. Subject to the
20 foregoing objections, NTC will supplement and respond to the relevant subject matter, if any, called
21 for by Request for Admission No. 20 seasonably after FMA serves its Local Rule 26.2 pre-discovery
22 disclosures.

24 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 21:**

25 Admit that prior to engaging Guam counsel to file *Nanya Tech. Corp. v. Fujitsu Limited*, No.
26 06-CV-00025 in the District of Guam, Nanya had not negotiated any agreements in Guam concerning
27 the subject matter of this action.

OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 21:

NTC objects to Request for Admission No. 21 as premature. FMA has not served pre-discovery disclosures in this case as required by Local Rule 26.2 and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(a). Because no pre-discovery disclosures have been made, NTC is under no obligation whatsoever to respond. NTC further objects to Request for Admission No. 21 as seeking irrelevant to any claim or defense at issue in this case, including but not limited to jurisdiction and convenience. Subject to the foregoing objections, NTC will supplement and respond to the relevant subject matter, if any, called for by Request for Admission No. 21 seasonably after FMA serves its Local Rule 26.2 pre-discovery disclosures.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 22:

Admit that prior to engaging Guam counsel to file *Nanya Tech. Corp. v. Fujitsu Limited*, No. 06-CV-00025 in the District of Guam, Nanya had not executed any agreements in Guam concerning the subject matter of this action.

OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 22:

NTC objects to Request for Admission No. 22 as premature. FMA has not served pre-discovery disclosures in this case as required by Local Rule 26.2 and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(a). Because no pre-discovery disclosures have been made, NTC is under no obligation whatsoever to respond. NTC further objects to Request for Admission No. 22 as seeking irrelevant to any claim or defense at issue in this case, including but not limited to jurisdiction and convenience. Subject to the foregoing objections, NTC will supplement and respond to the relevant subject matter, if any, called for by Request for Admission No. 22 seasonably after FMA serves its Local Rule 26.2 pre-discovery disclosures.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 23:

Admit that prior to engaging Guam counsel to file *Nanya Tech. Corp. v. Fujitsu Limited*, No.

1 06-CV-00025 in the District of Guam, Nanya had not executed any agreements that called for Nanya's
2 performance in Guam concerning the subject matter of this action.

3 **OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 23:**

4 NTC objects to Request for Admission No. 23 as premature. FMA has not served pre-
5 discovery disclosures in this case as required by Local Rule 26.2 and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure
6 26(a). Because no pre-discovery disclosures have been made, NTC is under no obligation whatsoever
7 to respond. NTC further objects to Request for Admission No. 23 as seeking irrelevant to any claim or
8 defense at issue in this case, including but not limited to jurisdiction and convenience. Subject to the
9 foregoing objections, NTC will supplement and respond to the relevant subject matter, if any, called
10 for by Request for Admission No. 23 seasonably after FMA serves its Local Rule 26.2 pre-discovery
11 disclosures.
12

13 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 24:**

14 Admit that prior to engaging Guam counsel to file *Nanya Tech. Corp. v. Fujitsu Limited*, No.
15 06-CV-00025 in the District of Guam, Nanya had no correspondence with Fujitsu in Guam.

16 **OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 24:**

17 NTC objects to Request for Admission No. 24 as premature. FMA has not served pre-
18 discovery disclosures in this case as required by Local Rule 26.2 and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure
19 26(a). Because no pre-discovery disclosures have been made, NTC is under no obligation whatsoever
20 to respond. NTC further objects to Request for Admission No. 24 as seeking irrelevant to any claim or
21 defense at issue in this case, including but not limited to jurisdiction and convenience. Subject to the
22 foregoing objections, NTC will supplement and respond to the relevant subject matter, if any, called
23 for by Request for Admission No. 24 seasonably after FMA serves its Local Rule 26.2 pre-discovery
24 disclosures.
25
26
27
28

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 25:

Admit that prior to engaging Guam counsel to file *Nanya Tech. Corp. v. Fujitsu Limited*, No. 06-CV-00025 in the District of Guam, Nanya had no correspondence with FMA in Guam.

OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 25:

NTC objects to Request for Admission No. 25 as premature. FMA has not served pre-discovery disclosures in this case as required by Local Rule 26.2 and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(a). Because no pre-discovery disclosures have been made, NTC is under no obligation whatsoever to respond. NTC further objects to Request for Admission No. 25 as seeking irrelevant to any claim or defense at issue in this case, including but not limited to jurisdiction and convenience. Subject to the foregoing objections, NTC will supplement and respond to the relevant subject matter, if any, called for by Request for Admission No. 25 seasonably after FMA serves its Local Rule 26.2 pre-discovery disclosures.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 26:

Admit that prior to engaging Guam counsel to file *Nanya Tech. Corp. v. Fujitsu Limited*, No. 06-CV-00025 in the District of Guam, Nanya had no correspondence with Fujitsu relating to any business in Guam.

OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 26:

NTC objects to Request for Admission No. 26 as premature. FMA has not served pre-discovery disclosures in this case as required by Local Rule 26.2 and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(a). Because no pre-discovery disclosures have been made, NTC is under no obligation whatsoever to respond. NTC further objects to Request for Admission No. 26 as seeking irrelevant to any claim or defense at issue in this case, including but not limited to jurisdiction and convenience. Subject to the foregoing objections, NTC will supplement and respond to the relevant subject matter, if any, called for by Request for Admission No. 26 seasonably after FMA serves its Local Rule 26.2 pre-discovery

1 disclosures.

2 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 27:**

3 Admit that prior to engaging Guam counsel to file *Nanya Tech. Corp. v. Fujitsu Limited*, No.
 4 06-CV-00025 in the District of Guam, Nanya had no correspondence with FMA relating to any
 5 business in Guam.

6 **OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 27:**

7 NTC objects to Request for Admission No. 27 as premature. FMA has not served pre-
 8 discovery disclosures in this case as required by Local Rule 26.2 and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure
 9 26(a). Because no pre-discovery disclosures have been made, NTC is under no obligation whatsoever
 10 to respond. NTC further objects to Request for Admission No. 27 as seeking irrelevant to any claim or
 11 defense at issue in this case, including but not limited to jurisdiction and convenience. Subject to the
 12 foregoing objections, NTC will supplement and respond to the relevant subject matter, if any, called
 13 for by Request for Admission No. 27 seasonably after FMA serves its Local Rule 26.2 pre-discovery
 14 disclosures.

15 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 28:**

16 Admit that Nanya does not file a tax return in Guam.

17 **OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 28:**

18 NTC objects to Request for Admission No. 28 as premature. FMA has not served pre-
 19 discovery disclosures in this case as required by Local Rule 26.2 and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure
 20 26(a). Because no pre-discovery disclosures have been made, NTC is under no obligation whatsoever
 21 to respond. NTC further objects to Request for Admission No. 28 as seeking irrelevant to any claim or
 22 defense at issue in this case, including but not limited to jurisdiction and convenience. Subject to the
 23 foregoing objections, NTC will supplement and respond to the relevant subject matter, if any, called
 24 for by Request for Admission No. 28 seasonably after FMA serves its Local Rule 26.2 pre-discovery
 25 disclosures.

1 disclosures.

2 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 29:**

3 Admit that Nanya does not distribute any products concerning the subject matter of this action
4 in Guam.

5 **OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 29:**

6 NTC objects to Request for Admission No. 29 as premature. FMA has not served pre-
7 discovery disclosures in this case as required by Local Rule 26.2 and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure
8 26(a). Because no pre-discovery disclosures have been made, NTC is under no obligation whatsoever
9 to respond. NTC further objects to Request for Admission No. 29 as seeking irrelevant to any claim or
10 defense at issue in this case, including but not limited to jurisdiction and convenience. Subject to the
11 foregoing objections, NTC will supplement and respond to the relevant subject matter, if any, called
12 for by Request for Admission No. 29 seasonably after FMA serves its Local Rule 26.2 pre-discovery
13 disclosures.

14 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 30:**

15 Admit that Nanya Accused Products are offered for sale in the Northern District of California.

16 **OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 30:**

17 NTC objects to Request for Admission No. 30 as premature. FMA has not served pre-
18 discovery disclosures in this case as required by Local Rule 26.2 and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure
19 26(a). Because no pre-discovery disclosures have been made, NTC is under no obligation whatsoever
20 to respond. NTC further objects to Request for Admission No. 30 as seeking irrelevant to any claim or
21 defense at issue in this case, including but not limited to jurisdiction and convenience. Subject to the
22 foregoing objections, NTC will supplement and respond to the relevant subject matter, if any, called
23 for by Request for Admission No. 30 seasonably after FMA serves its Local Rule 26.2 pre-discovery
24 disclosures.

1 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 31:**

2 Admit that Nanya Accused Products are sold in the Northern District of California.

3 **OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 31:**

4 NTC objects to Request for Admission No. 31 as premature. FMA has not served pre-
5 discovery disclosures in this case as required by Local Rule 26.2 and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure
6 26(a). Because no pre-discovery disclosures have been made, NTC is under no obligation whatsoever
7 to respond. NTC further objects to Request for Admission No. 31 as seeking irrelevant to any claim or
8 defense at issue in this case, including but not limited to jurisdiction and convenience. Subject to the
9 foregoing objections, NTC will supplement and respond to the relevant subject matter, if any, called
10 for by Request for Admission No. 31 seasonably after FMA serves its Local Rule 26.2 pre-discovery
11 disclosures.

12 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 32:**

13 Admit that Nanya Accused Products are imported into the Northern District of California.

14 **OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 32:**

15 NTC objects to Request for Admission No. 32 as premature. FMA has not served pre-
16 discovery disclosures in this case as required by Local Rule 26.2 and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure
17 26(a). Because no pre-discovery disclosures have been made, NTC is under no obligation whatsoever
18 to respond. NTC further objects to Request for Admission No. 32 as seeking irrelevant to any claim or
19 defense at issue in this case, including but not limited to jurisdiction and convenience. Subject to the
20 foregoing objections, NTC will supplement and respond to the relevant subject matter, if any, called
21 for by Request for Admission No. 32 seasonably after FMA serves its Local Rule 26.2 pre-discovery
22 disclosures.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 33:

Admit that Nanya obtains revenue from Nanya Accused Products sold within the Northern District of California.

OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 33:

NTC objects to Request for Admission No. 33 as premature. FMA has not served pre-discovery disclosures in this case as required by Local Rule 26.2 and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(a). Because no pre-discovery disclosures have been made, NTC is under no obligation whatsoever to respond. NTC further objects to Request for Admission No. 33 as seeking irrelevant to any claim or defense at issue in this case, including but not limited to jurisdiction and convenience. Subject to the foregoing objections, NTC will supplement and respond to the relevant subject matter, if any, called for by Request for Admission No. 33 seasonably after FMA serves its Local Rule 26.2 pre-discovery disclosures.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 34:

Admit that the United States District Court for the Northern District of California has personal jurisdiction over Nanya.

OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 34:

NTC objects to Request for Admission No. 34 as premature. FMA has not served pre-discovery disclosures in this case as required by Local Rule 26.2 and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(a). Because no pre-discovery disclosures have been made, NTC is under no obligation whatsoever to respond. NTC further objects to Request for Admission No. 34 as seeking irrelevant to any claim or defense at issue in this case, including but not limited to jurisdiction and convenience. NTC further objects to Request for Admission No. 34 as not seeking facts, but a legal conclusion for a court to decide. Subject to the foregoing objections, NTC will supplement and respond to the relevant subject matter, if any, called for by Request for Admission No. 34 seasonably after FMA serves its Local Rule

1 26.2 pre-discovery disclosures.

2
3 Dated: April 23, 2007

SHORE CHAN BRAGALONE LLP

5 By: /s/ Alfonso Garcia Chan
6 ALFONSO GARCIA CHAN, ESQ.
(admitted *pro hac vice*)

7 ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFFS
8 Nanya Technology Corp. and
Nanya Technology Corp. U.S.A.

1 **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**
2

3 I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing document was served on the
4 following counsel of record via electronic mail and confirmatory first class mail on April 23, 2007:

5 Rodney J. Jacob
6 Daniel M. Benjamin
7 Calvo & Clark, LLP
8 655 South Marine Corps Dr., Suite 202
9 Tamuning, Guam 96913

10 Michael M. Murray
11 Milbank Tweed Hadley & McCloy LLP
12 1 Chase Manhattan Plaza
13 New York, New York 10005-1413

14 _____
15 /s/ Alfonso Garcia Chan
16 ALFONSO GARCIA CHAN

17 ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFFS
18 Nanya Technology Corp. and
19 Nanya Technology Corp. U.S.A.